

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

ORDER

Defendant's renewed Motion (**Doc. 122**) for recusal is **DENIED**. Defendant's positions present the proverbial snake eating its tail. A party cannot properly attempt to manufacture grounds for recusal, and then cite the court's rebuking of his efforts as further grounds of bias.

See Barnett v. Hall, Estill, Hardwick, Gable, Golden & Nelson, P.C., 2018 WL 3023094, *2 (N.D. Okla. June 18, 2018) (a litigant “may not, by his own conduct, manufacture grounds for recusal[, f]or example, a judge is not required to recuse . . . because of a litigant’s intemperate and scurrilous attacks, in or out of court”) (citations omitted).

To be clear, the undersigned bears no animosity, whatsoever, regarding this Defendant; and he can rest assured that he will receive a fair and impartial application of the laws in his case. Along the lines of snakes-eating-tails, any anticipated renewal of the request for recusal, based on the contents of the present Order, will be summarily denied. It is time for Defendant and the Court to “move on.”

IT IS SO ORDERED.

May 31, 2019

s\Cathy Bissoon

Cathy Bissoon

United States District Judge

cc (via ECF email notification):

All Counsel of Record